

REMARKS

Interview Summary

An in-depth telephonic interview was conducted on November 7, 2008 with Examiners Maury Audet and Andrew Kosar to discuss the proposed claim language submitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 21, 2008. The only issue discussed was language of the claim. The examiners asserted that the claim took too much time and effort to understand. In an effort to comply, applicants now propose yet another proposed claim set. As suggested by the examiners, a separate sequence has been added to identify each of the peptide monomer units. Formerly this was a subsequence within a larger sequence.

Amendments to the Claims

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office asked that applicants present the claims in a new manner to emphasize particular structural characteristics. In order to comply with the request, applicants submit herewith a substitute sequence listing (in computer readable form and in paper form). The new claims 39, 40, and 41 refer to the newly added SEQ ID NO: 9 and 10, which are subsequences of previously disclosed SEQ ID NO: 3 and 5. The subsequences correspond to the previously disclosed peptide monomer units which can be attached to the hub.

The term hub has been deleted from the claims and replaced with either lysine or lysine, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office indicated that the term was unnecessary to describe the structures claimed.

New independent claim 39 replaces former claim 1 and new independent claims 41 and 42 replace former claims 37 and 38. Each of claims 41 and 42 recites one of the two alternatives recited of claim 39.

Dependent claims 9-13 are now dependent on new claim 39. New dependent claims 42-46 and 47-51 are identical to claims 9-13, but each group is dependent on new independent claims 41 and 42, respectively.

It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added. The changes to the claims are a matter of form only, and are made at the behest of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Rejection of Claims 1-15 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the new claim language obviates the issues previously raised in the rejection, by eliminating the questioned phrases and terms.

In view of the claim amendments, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and a speedy allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
By: /Sarah A. Kagan/
Sarah A. Kagan
Registration No. 32,141

Date: November 25, 2008

Banner & Witcoff
Customer No: 22907